

PATENT
450100-03064**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the remarks herewith.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 8 and 13 are independent.

II. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatenable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,228 to Chapman et al.

Claims 7-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatenable over U.S. Patent No. 6,216,228 to Chapman et al. in view of U.S. Publication No. 20030126445 A1 to Wehrenberg.

Independent claim 1, recites, *inter alia*:

“...first fetching means for fetching identification information, input by a user, used for identification of a recording medium;

second fetching means for fetching a permission condition, input by the user, for permitting playback of the image information recorded on a recording medium...

first comparison means for comparing the identification information extracted by said extraction means and the identification information stored in said storage means with each other;

third fetching means for fetching a permission condition when the identification information extracted by said extraction means and the identification information stored in said storage means coincide with each other;

PATENT
450100-03064

second comparison means for comparing the permission condition fetched by said third fetching means and the permission condition stored in said storage means with each other..." (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants U.S. Patent No. 6,216,228 to Chapman, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Chapman") relates to a method and a system for controlling display of video or image data depending on content classification information, which is integrated with data by invisible digital watermarking techniques. A controller decodes the watermarked content codes and then prevents displaying of certain material, by overlaying the display with blanking data, if the codes match certain stored codes.

Specifically, Chapman teaches that a video signal is processed by an encoder that embeds an electronic watermark within each still image of the video signal. The electronic watermark represents a classification of the video content. A user then selects particular classifications which are not to be displayed.

As understood by Applicants, Chapman is teaching a filter based on a classification system.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that cited portions of Chapman do teach a fetching means. However, in contrast to Applicants first fetching means, second fetching means, and third fetching means, Chapman's first fetching means fetches a television signal. Then Chapman does teach an extracting means. However, Chapman's extracting means extracts a watermark from a television signal. The watermark identifies a classification that the television signal belongs to. Chapman does then use a second fetching means to fetch a look-up table of classification codes which are stored in memory.

PATENT
450100-03064

Chapman then uses a comparing means to compare the extracted signal to classification codes that are stored in a look up table. A user selects which particular classifications of programs that are not to be displayed. A control means then identifies a match between the content classification codes of the received video data and stored codes which the end user has specified as not to be displayed, and prevents displaying of the video data which includes the particular watermarked classification codes.

If it is assumed that the above read on Applicants' present invention, Chapman would have a first fetching means, a second fetching means, a storage means, a first comparison means, and a control means. Applicants submit that nothing in the cited portions of Chapman teach or suggest an apparatus comprising a third fetching means for fetching a permission condition when the identification information extracted by said extraction means and the identification information stored in said storage means coincide with each other and a second comparison means for comparing the permission condition fetched by said third fetching means and the permission condition stored in said storage means with each other.

Applicants, therefore, submit that nothing has been found in the cited portions of Chapman that would teach or suggest an apparatus comprising first fetching means for fetching identification information, input by a user, used for identification of a recording medium; second fetching means for fetching a permission condition, input by the user, for permitting playback of the image information recorded on a recording medium; storage means for storing the identification information fetched by said first fetching means and the permission condition fetched by said second fetching means; extraction means for

PATENT
450100-03064

extracting the identification information recorded on a recording medium loaded in said information playback apparatus; first comparison means for comparing the identification information extracted by said extraction means and the identification information stored in said storage means with each other; third fetching means for fetching a permission condition when the identification information extracted by said extraction means and the identification information stored in said storage means coincide with each other; second comparison means for comparing the permission condition fetched by said third fetching means and the permission condition stored in said storage means with each other; and control means for controlling playback of the image information recorded on the recording medium in response to a result of the comparison by said second comparison means, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants further submit that Column 6, lines 39-48, and column 7, lines 41-54, which are applied by the Office Action in the above rejection, do not teach the above-recited limitation. The current Office Action states "Chapman does teach the 'fetching means by the user' limitation", however, Applicants submit that claim 1 does not claim "fetching means by the user" as stated in the Office Action.

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 4, 5, and 6 are also believed to be patentable for the above-recited reasons.

Independent claim 8 recites, *inter alia*:

"...establishing a permission condition associated with a playback device, as a function of first input by a user... establishing a recording medium identification for each of one or more recording media, as a

PATENT
450100-03064

function of second input by the user...
comparing the stored permission condition and the
stored recording medium identification for a
particular recording medium,
wherein **when the permission condition satisfies a
predetermined relationship with the recording
medium identification, a valid password, input
by a user, is required to initiate playback of the
particular recording medium.**" (emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, U.S. Publication No. 20030126445 A1 to Wehrenberg (hereinafter, merely "Wehrenberg") relates to a copy protection technique utilizing a watermark and a permission key. The copy protection can be used to prevent unauthorized copying of data stored on a recording medium. Wehrenberg is directed to providing a copy protection scheme that allows a viewer to make one copy of a transmission, but prevents further copying after initial copy is made.

Applicants submit that in claim 8, user input is used to establish a permission condition associated with a playback device. A second user input is used to establish a recording medium identification. The established permission condition and recording medium identification are later compared. When the comparison of the two satisfy a predetermined condition, a valid password is still necessary to facilitate playback. The user inputs the valid password.

Applicants submit that neither Chapman nor Wehrenberg teach or suggest the above-identified features of claim 8. Therefore, claim 8 is believed to be patentable.

Independent claim 13 is also believed to be patentable for the above-recited reasons.

PATENT
450100-03064**III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the above-identified reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION


In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of the statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate the portion, or portions, of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Applicants submit that this After-Final Response does not require further search and that all of the claims are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of this After-Final Amendment and early passage to issue of the present application.

PATENT
450100-03064

Please charge any fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to
our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212)588-0800

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☒ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.